M1070
Open Meeting, Palo Alto, California
Tuesday, November 8, 1966
Tape I of 2 tapes

Must Remain in Transcription Room

Mr. Nyland: Good Don? O.K.? Started already? Huh? All set? Do you want to stand there or don't want to sit? Is it all right? So we'll assume then that most of you know something about Gurdjieff. I'm sure that some of you have read about him. By this time I think Gurdjieff's name is well enough known--perhaps not the way I would like it, but in any event sufficient to get an idea of what is meant when one says Gurdjieff or objectivity or in a certain way becoming conscious. And for that reason, if there are any different questions so always much better to try to link it up with a question from you so that I know what might be on your mind otherwise I may talk at cross purposes. So, is there anything you might like to discuss? What, it doesn't matter, but at least we can manage. Who of you have read anything of Gurdjieff? All and Everything? Huh? Who understood it? (Laughter) Any questions on that? What is meant when we talk about objectivity? It's not that I don't want to start. I don't, I just don't want to get into a lecture, you know. It is much better to have a subject that you are interested in. We talk about that, and from htere on of course we can talk in all kind of different directions. It's a way of becoming conscious. It's a way of trying to find out if man actually could become different from what he is at the present time; with the assumption, of course, that what he is now is not at all complete. That is a fundamental assumption that there's a possibility for an evolution if one only knows how to evolve. That at the same time as far as earth is concerned, man has reached his limit. That he is, as far as his physical body is concerned, of course is not growing anymore. That his feeling center, if that is a center, is only up to a certain point; his intellect is very very little developed

compared to what it might become. For that reason certain things have to be introduced which are not given naturally, which do not primarily exist on earth. Although if man wishes to grow, he can find out what has to be done, and it is not simply a matter of stating the conditions of man is way he is and simply let it go at that. Because I think that is already so well-known that we in the present world in the situation which we find ourselves that there are many things that could be changed, that perhaps ought to be changed, and that some people try to change it, and very often if you come to a conclusion that what it is at the present time compared to even 50 years ago--that we are going downhill and this in many different directions. The question is however, is notwithstanding the difficulties that people are in and whatever man now represents--if there still is a possibility of him to do something about it. And it is not a question of putting some salve on the wound but that actually the blood system can be changed and that the blood becomes purer and as a result man could become healthier, psychologically as well as physically. So now, what do you know about that? Or rather, what, what bothers you about such a statement?

QUESTION: I wonder if you could talk about self-remembering and what it involves and how to try it?

Mr. Nyland: The method by which we try to define how man could become conscious. The assumption is that man is at the present time not conscious, that what he calls his mental functions is a form of unconsciousness. And simply we use such words because one can indicate that if this unconscious can exist, also the possibility of a conscious state must exist; otherwise I wouldn't call it unconscious. That man as he is in his so-called waking state according to Gurdjieffian terms is still asleep. He's half-way awake, half asleep. And that the next step for him would really be to be awake in the real sense of the word.

That would be the same as being conscious and that the next step of development if man wants to--or rather if he has an ability for doing it--that he could reach a certain state of cosmic consciousness. That is on the one side of the scale going up. Going down from his waking -sleeping state, there's another stage below that that's ordinary sleep. The method by which one tries to reach--or go from the stage of waking-sleeping state to a state of self-consciousness is by means of what is called self-remembering. Self-remembering is not a good word. Self-remember is self in the first place, and the remembering. It is not a question of memory; it is not remembering of that what has happened in the past because that what is indicated if one wants to use the word objectivity, also as something that distinguishes it from a subjective existence, that then the memory is exactly the wrong thing, because memory remains always subjective. So there is a certain meaning to that self-remembering and particularly when it can be explained that the self of man is not always the same and has changed since he was born. That there was at the time of birth and perhaps already before that as conception during that particular period that man had a Self and that represented such a person. And when a child is born, this particular form of life as represented by a Self was put in that form of a body and then lives on earth and after that body dies, then that what is his Self, his particular form of life which he represents, then it returns in some way or other to the totality of all life, or perhaps has to continue in some form for further self-perfection. It's, you might say, an assumption; it's very difficult to prove it, but in any event, this Self changes as man continues to live on earth in his life, and not so much that it changes any particular quality of itself but that it is is covered up more and more by what we call education and civilization and the general ways by which a person is exposed to conditions of life as he lives it and that protects himself

against it. This particular Self--if one takes a young child-is unspoiled because the child himself is uninhibited and at that ime this form that could be called a coat of protection is not as yet sufficiently formed and therefore the child itself can act in accordance with that what is the requirement of this Self, which is a form of life and trying to assert itself and to try to continue to live and maintain itself and perhaps on that particular redirection has an idea that there is another kind of a function that has to be born on earth. When I say I remember myself I mean that by this self I distinguish my ordinary self that I use now in ordinary life when I'm mature and compare it with that what I used to be when I was a child and when that self was more unspoiled. So the memory now goes back to that what was an earlier appearance on Earth of life within a child which by living in this particular world has been covered in some way or other and it's very difficult to distinguish it now or find out what it really is because the coverings are not transparent. When I wish to remember this that is how it used to be. I have to have a certain measure of what I really could understand by an unspoilt condition of myself--and that my memory then in wishing to remember has to have a certain definite reason why I want that and not the way I am at the present time. The way I am now, I'm not quite sure of what I really am. It is very difficult to study oneself because many times the way I want to study myself is either by thinking apparatus or by feeling. I will ge certain results that I c nsider then for me data as a result of that form of childhood--it is the observing in the ordinary sense of the word--that I accummulate about myself certain facts and if I have to describe myself, I would use them in order to indicate this is what I am. It is questionable if that what I think about myself is actually the truth. And in most cases I am afraid that whenever I start to say, when thinking about myself, that I am this and I behave like that and that--it is very often tinted

with the wish that I would like to be that, and it is not exact. It is difficult to remain exact but in any event it is questionable that I-- I am almost certain that I do not reach an absolute fact, and still for the form of communication it is necessary to have facts in an absolute sense because I cannot afford to take away personal interpretation from everyone and If I cannot do that, I cannot exchange between two people; that is, two people can not exchange among themselves. The reason why self-remembering as a method or as a means of reaching a certain different state is importa t is that what I used to be in an unspoilt state will give me more truth about myself. I am after all interested in the form of life which is now represented by myself as a human being and it is then if this form of life actually should have existed the way it did and if at the time when I die something still can remain in existence and then if--when man is living is he simply subject to the rules of living on earth? Meaning by that that if he is born and afterwards dies that that is all there is to it. Philosophically speaking, of course, it is not a very interesting subject to assume that one simply dies and that is the end. And that for that reason one is a little bit more logical that one hopes at least that something can remain in existence particularly if you consider a certain struggle that man very often goes through when he is living--that then you might say that he is entitled to have some kind of a result which could be more permanent for him. But be that as it may, the question is if during this particular life he is preparing for something else it should in any event already be obvious that when he is now living that the thoughts and the possible change-over into something for a life later on must now affect him now in a certain way, so that he is not only preparing but that he in the real sense of the word could become a better man. By that term is understood, in the terminology of Gurdjieff, a man who is harmonious. And the harmoniousness, that is that what is really represented by what a man should be is an even

equilibrium or a balance between what man at the present time consists of. And for the sake of argument we simply assume that he consists of three different parts and we call them in general physical,and emotional or feeling, and his intellectual capacity. They are of course not equal; they have different kind of functions to fulfill; they form part of the personality and if I would consider personality as I see them around me and as I know myself, I know that I am many times not in balance at all. And that sometimes there is a very, a very great difficulty of having all three of these different parts of myself function at the same time or at least in harmony with each other. I know this of course by experience that the intellectual and feeling centers very often are at odds, that there is very often a struggle between the two. That one says go left and the other says go right, and that only the strongest will win and that surely that is not a form or an example of harmony. Why does man really become interested in harmony? Why does he thing that it is necessary to do something about his life? Why can't he assume that simply being born that he will die and that again that that will be the end? I think there is in each person a certain wish to protect himself--even physically or in any other way when he is exposed to danger and that would indicate that there is something in him that he considers precious, that he wants to preserve. And why he wants to preserve it is probably because somehow or other deep down within himself he has a sense of responsibility. That certain things have been given to him or at least that he finds himself on Earth in that kind of a condition and that when he wants to assume a responsibility that he then also wants to go all the way through with it whenever he fulfills that responsibility and then you might say has become a good manager--that then he is entitled to some kind of credit. It is probably a very strange way of saying it, and still there has to be a motivation for man whenever he wants to consider his life in a serious sense and not just superficially living the way it comes and going out the way he has come in.

Why should a man be serious? Also it is a difficult question because if I can get away with not being serious, if everything goes in the right direction for me, if it is like sailing with the wind, if I have enough money or recognition or respect or a certain form of prosperity, I have no particular interest to do anything more because I think I have already reached it. Why I have reached it may be because I made the efforts myself--if I am religious, I say that God has given it to me; or in any event when I am already satisfied and I have no particular questions about my life I, of course, will never be interested in a possible further evolution because I am satisfied. For those people who are satisfied, who have no questions, who are not sufficiently serious, or who even are smug, this idea of objectivity, idea of self-remembering, has, of course,absolutely no appeal. And they shouldn't even try. For those who are curious it may be because they would like to satisfy a certain desire in themselves to finally become clear about what the place is of man in the world, or the meaning of his existence. And very often we follow any direction of philosophy or science in order to find out where we really belong and why are we here. And why are we in the state in which we are and if that state is still acceptable or we have made adjustments to it and even if we will a few, a little bit of questions, and we simply say, "Ahh, it will go away. Tomorrow, the sun will shine!" Again and again I fall back to an ordinary state of my common existence and in that, having made the adjustment, I am satisfied in becoming a good man. The question that really concerns one is if man is actually made up of these kinds of statements-intellectual and sometimes a little bit in his feeling center--or if there is something that you might consider his deeper inner life. And that that would represent in a religious sense or even in the sense of creation, something that perhaps could develop for him if he had that kind of an understanding and that by means of that he would find much more balance in himself because his intellect is filled many times with

conflicting ideas but his own botany. But when there is something in his feeling or in his emotion which is not entirely quite right, then he is not at ease and perhaps because of that he will try to find out how can he, being in contact with that what he assumes that might exist above him or around him or in him--some kind of a way that he himself could become more in equilibrium. Again, the motivations for each person--why they become more or less religious, why they are interested in philosophy, why that form of life they live in their ordinary existence professionally, economically, is not always gratifying to them. And why they have those sorts of questions within themselves which sometimes seems to be unsolved--again each person must answer that particular question for himself in his way. And they they start to find, to try to find out how to solve the question. I say whenever someone has questions and he does not want to solve them, if he actually could get a picture of himself that way, he would have to come to a conclusion that he is not much of a man. He simply will take things as they are quite unconsciously, live his life, and forget about the rest. Apres nous le deluge--it doesn't matter. When it does matter he starts to find out for himself what is there that is valuable, and if that what is valuable is his innter life as compared to the superficialities of ordinary living, then of course he will want to find out if that inner life actually is in the right place and if it could grow. Again, yous see, we turn around a little bit--why would I wish to self-remember when I am already a grown-up man? What is it that at the present time I cannot find so easily and for which I would have to remember something that I can only remember and which I do not experience and which belongs to my past and how little do I know about the past. And again, thinking about it and trying to imagine how it used to be--and then I say I self-remember that. And now I wish with this particular way of remembering create a certain condition in myself at

the present time which may be comparable to the state in which I was when I was born. It is much better to use something that has to do with a direct way of how to wake up. Because after all, that is the whole point. I'm interested to get from one state in which I find myself now being so-called awake-asleep. Of sometimes in that particular state I dream about the possibility of freedom. And at the present time I will have to assume, and I can also verify, that I am not at all a free agent, and that I constantly in my dealings with other people in particular I will react to that which they, you might say, send onto me. And if I might consider an impression which I receive and immediately in receiving such an impression, I will answer in a certain way, I call it a reaction, almost or sometimes in an unconscious way or a habit, sometimes, when I think about it, in a certain pattern, and also in accordance with what I am as a type or personality. If I want to really be honest and try to think about myself being able to think originally--that is, only in accordance with what belongs to me, that many times I must come to the conclusion that I think the thoughts of someone else before me, and that is the kind of information that is of course in my brain because I happen to have read a great deal or maybe I have had contact with interesting people, so-called. The level of myself--that what I am as a human being, that what I am as a man, that what I would require as a definition of a harmonious man--this is really the important part. What do I understand of what a man is and what he should be? It is constant conflict of man as he is on earth. Should he become something else, sometimes we say "hereafter"? Or should he during his lifetime take a responsibility on himself that he should develop quite definitely in a certain direction? And if the direction is away from earth as represented by freedom, then the question is how can I become free when I am still on earth? With other words, if I am in a waking-sleeping state, again I say that this so-called sleeping state in what I call an awakening when I am unconscious must have a very definite meaning. And sometimes it refers to my unconscious

states as habits and sometimes it refers to that what I am as reactive creature and only a few wishes here and there which sometimes I can satisfy and sometimes I don't. As far as clear logical thinking is concerned, again I will have trouble to keep on thinking logically until the very end because it becomes much too difficult for me. And moreover, if this includes a freedom from subjectivity, that is if man represents on a earth a subjective being, that then if he wishes to get away from earth, if that is the direction he wants to go, he has to become free from himself subjectively and something else should be substituted which he might consider only from the standpoint of non-subjectivity, because it is very difficult to define what is objective. Is it necessary for man to become objective? Again that same question, if he continues to sharpen his intellect or his feeling center or even his physical, will he ultimately reach a state that will be satisfactory to him? Will he by means of that reach the state which Gurdjeff defines as harmonious man or will he reach a certain state of contact with a higher form of being or life which he perhaps would call his god and in that sense then be united with that what perhaps is really the purpose ofhis life? And at the same time has he then fulfilled the obligations which he has as man simply because of the fact that he was born on earth? Is the purpose of man to become an angel as soon as possible or to be with god without having done anything on earth? Again this question is not easily solved because why should I assume that simply because I was born on earth without my knowledge and without anything that I had to do with it, without even having to take credit for it, but certainly not that it was in accordance with my own wish, I find myself being born and on earth as a matter of fact in very difficult circumstance because life on earth in general is not easy. And if I have that kind of a mind or feeling that I want to consider things, I may sometimes be quite pessimistic. Why should I then, not being responsible for my own will, take the responsibility for the maintenance of my life which was caused by my

birth? Again you see, these questions belong naturally to a person who wants to live in a serious way, not superficially. A person who can consier that man might have for himself two,at least two, different ways of looking at himself. One, the outside of himself as he is as a personality and the other, what he would consider it, even at his good moments, his essence. Is man a representation of something else? Cosmologically is the earth a part of a totality of a certain system? Is there a certain organization without going into detail considering God sitting on the throne and directing it? I s there a certain natural law as far as earth and our solar system is concerned? Is there a law outside of it which might govern different constellations and the relationships of stars? Is there something that I say there is quite definitely a relationship which seems to go in accordance with laws? And why is man at the present time interested sometimes in discovering what is really, what is really the reason for the existence of the universe? Why is it that man wants a religion? Why does he want to deify certain things for himself in order to have clarification or that perhaps at times he wants to pray towards them? Why is it that man when he wants to create should find within himself the possibility of living that what perhaps is his best, perhaps even at the cost of himself? Why is it that we consider certain condition in relationship to be between people more pure when we are less selfish? Why is it that it is necessary for the balance in oneself that one must assume that there is a possibility of a spiritual development because that what is ordinary surface, ordinary physical existence is not satisfying to a great many people? The world as we have it, as we see it, the world as it is populated, the world as we see it in our friends, in ourselves, are we really satified with how they are? And if I look at myself, Am I satisfied in the way I behave? Why do I get angry at myself? Why do I say that I want to do this or that, and I cannot do it? Why do I sometimes believe that I can do it, and I'm frustrated

when it turns out that I cannot be that way? When I say I don't wish to get angry, and the next moment something happens, and all of a sudden I find myself angry; why is it that I am jealous; why can't I place friendships and animosities in the proper light? Why is it I constantly mix up different things in relationships with other people from myself and usually try to solve them in such a way that they are the least damage to me? Why is it that I even, technologically speaking, will want to go to the line of least resistence instead of going through all kind of trouble in order to achieve a certain purpose? Why is it that we industrially now are adjusted to a possibility of having such an easy life that we don't know what to do with our leisure? Such, of course, are problems partly a little economical and partly political, but nevertheless, when one comes to the state of man as he is, is man as he is now on earth part of something that you might call the totality of everything existing, and is it necessary to assume that there is a certain form of a deity, not necessarily called God, but that of which man is part, if he understands his own world? Is there for man a world of himself, and is it possible in this particular world, that is he, that there might be a possible evolution? These of course become very important questions when one sees how, how unable we are to fulfill even ordinary little promises to ourselves. That we are really not in every way reliable. That many times of course not only that we are reactive creatures but that we lie about ourselves and we try to get away with it. That really, if we want to be quite honest, that we must admit that at times we are terrible. Now perhaps it is not a matter of criticism and perhaps it is a condition in which everybody finds himself if he wanted to admit it, that it would be acknowledged by everyone, and we wouldn't have to hide it. But that's not the way we life. Why do we want to appear better than what we are? Why do we waste so much time in order to establish ourselves in the eyes of someone else? Why are we dependent on a certain form of respect? What is it

in us that we call self-love and vanity? Because there is no question that we are that way and that very seldom even if we are meek that we make a vanity of our meekness. Is it really true that man could live a different kind of life? Is it possible on earth to live that way or are the conditions on earth in such a way, earth being at particular place where it is in the solar system and in relation to the planets, even in the relation to the sun, or what is this as moon for us which has a definite effect on us? What are, anthropologically speaking again, the different kinds of nations or tribes or aboriginies which live in accordance with their knowledge and why do we wish to add to the knowledge, and if we have the knowledge, is it sufficient for us to have an understanding? Dow we actually understand what is the level of our being? Do we spend our time the way we should spend it? Are we sufficently responsible for that what is energies which have been, you might say, given to us, or at least that we have a chance to digest? Do we spend it correctly? If I look at my particular time, the way I spend it, then compare it to the results I achieve, am I sometimes lazy, and intentionally so? Do I want to get away with certain things that someone else can do for me so that I don't have to do them? Do I still believe in the honesty of work? Again technology will come into that in substituting something that is perhaps just as good, but you know many times it is just as good as ersatz. It is something that is given, and then I have not earned it. Is it necessary for man to work, that he has to earn his living with the sweat of his brow? Why was man banished from Paradise? Again such questions--Yes, well, you. You had a question.

_____: I had a question, but I don't want to interrupt you.

Mr. Nyland: It won't hurt.

_____: O.K. I wonder whether you could speak very frankly to the question of internal work. What is constituted in that? What are the types of internal work which are necessary at the different levels and

how one comes to know that?

Mr. Nyland: Well, the thing is always if I talk about inner work I would have to use a couple of words that have a very definite meaning and unless a little ground work is laid for that, you know, you may not understand it. For instance if I use the word "observation."

_____: What word? The word what?

Mr. Nyland: "Observation." Observation is a word we use in ordinary life. And I say I observe, that means that I am alert or keen, that I see certain things and I observe them, and it is a registering. In the sense of Gurdjieff observation means that that what I become aware of has to become aware of without any further connotation, either of description or a liking. But you see, when I want to explain that, you have to understand also that this could only come about, be understanding, a relationship between what a mind ought to do and what a body is doing. And that therefore when I simply say the ABC of work, of how to become conscious, is OBSERVATION, IMPARTIALITY, and SIMULTANEITY, it has to be necessary, it is necessary, to explain what is meant by that. I will try to explain it in as simple a form as I can, but it is not something that is that easy. Simply say, "Here it is, and for 5 cents you can buy it." The understanding must based first on an assumption that that is the truth that I want to do it, simply because that what I try in by any other way, by means of thinking or feeling, will not give me the results that I hope to obtain by trying to become objective. And if I still believe that I can reach it by means of an improved thinking process, or that by constantly emotionally becoming involved in certain things and constantly remain in what I wish to do identified, then of course, I cannot be impartial, and according the the definition of objectivity, impartiality has to be a part of it. Now if I say observation, it simply means that a certain part of my brain has to start to function mentally simply by recording certain facts. And that the facts of myself as a

personality, as a form of behavior even if the behavior is a result of that what I feel or that what I happen to think, that I now wish to become impartial regarding that what I observe. And that the result of such observation would be a collection of data in a part of my brain which is trained to remain objective without being interfered with by any other kind of a center; that is, nothing of my feeling will enter into that what is received as a result of an observation. So you see, it implies that a part of my brain has to function quite differently from the usual way my brain is functioning because all of that what is taking place in my brain now as a mental result is of course in the first place subjectively colored. It is also interfered with by all kinds of feelings I have about it, and many times it logically will have to lead to an activity. The objective faculty requires only the statement of a fact and no more. It is not connected with any activity that has to follow; it is not connected with an like or dislike; it is not even described; it is only a certain form of being which is recognized as being. Now if I say that that objective faculty will give me a certain way of developing myself mentally, that I then if the brain could function that way totally, it would start to function independently of the rest of the organs of myself. Now maybe it is not important to see that I have to go through little steps like that in order to develop it, but I don't have any objective faculty at the present time. Everyt ing that I do, or feel, or think, of course, remains subjective. And as long as it is subjective and belongs to this earth, it is not free. When I say free, I mean freedom from earth. Freedom in exactly the same way as death would set my body free. If it is important to try to persue that, it is not a question. But in any event this is what Gurdjieff means. And he says by means of trying to follow t is, one could become harmonious. The impartiality means that there is no feeling expressed, not liking, no wish for change. That it has to be recorded at the moment, as meant by simultaneity or instantaneous-

ness, simply means that I want to eliminate all possibility of subjective thinking. And that the only time that I can do this, and my present mind is not capable of it, because it functions only by a memory or anticipation. It never lives or registers in the past. The past is too quick, becomes immediately--in the present, never lives in the present. The present immediately becomes the past. And in order to record it, I say simultaneous, that is at the same moment, the moment of living is then that which becomes reality for me. When it is--the moment--I can assume that it could be objective. Any time duration remains subjective. So the qu stion of simultaneity is not easily understood, but it is much more difficult even to put into practice. At the same time I will not have absolute fact until simultaneity is included.

_____: What is that word?

Mr. Nyland: Simultaneity, instantaneiousness, the instant of work, the moment of existence. If you know something about Zen--

_____: Yes, it sounds like it.

Mr. Nyland: That is right; yes, that is right; that is the concept. So these three things have to be fulfilled as a requirement for anyone who wishes to start work. And if one is interested in what to do, one starts then in the simplest form of trying to register the existence of oneself, and I select for that as obj ct that what is my body in different forms of behavior. If I want to satisfy impartiallity and simultaneity I don't want to observe the feeling processand I don't want to observe--in this sense now--a certain mental process because it will be very difficult to be impartial to it. But if I take the behavior form of my body, I can become more or less impartial when that what I am active in as a body is not too complicated. Particularly when there is something that is already habitual way of bheaving and I bring it to light as it were, then my consciousness does not play as much of a part--that is, my ordinary mental

process--so that I still have a chance to become objective regarding that form of behavior. The simple way now of trying to find out how can I develop an objective faculty in myself; afterwards the objective faculty as far as intellect is concerned would become consciousness; that would be an objective faculty regarding my emotions would become conscience. But in any event I now try to become aware of myself as this body behaves, with a tacit assumption and a hope that when I have once established something that I call a dexterity or knowledge how to become or how to use a method, how to sharpen that kind of a tool, that I could then apply it to almost any kind of an activity including a feeling activity or including a mental activity. And that also at the same time, I don't worry too much about it because the behavior form of my body is dictated by my feeling and my thoughts. And as a result then when the behavior is in one way, I might be able to trace the source of that behavior if I, you might say, go up the line and reach my feeling center, or if I reach my intellectual center. It is neighter here nor there. The beginning is difficult enough, in order to become objective to the ordinary forms of that what is now my body, behavior. Take movements. We select out of the forms of behavior a few different items you might say, like movements, like a posture, like a gesture, like a facial expression, and the tone of one's voice. These are five different forms of behavior that anyone, even from the outside even, can see, and I could become aware of them. Le me explain now again this word "aware." It is not the same as when we say alertness to something, that I say I am aware of your presence in this room. Awareness in the sense of Gurdjieff means that I am alert going over into the state of objectivity which I then call aware. And usually awareness is only a momentary experienc And that then by the same kind of reasoning that if a moment of time can describe a time dimension in one direction, that then I say the moment of awakening, a moment of awareness, would be a continuation of moments,

excuse me, that a moment of awareness if continued would describe the state of being awake. So I am interested now in trying to see if when I try to observe simple movements or simple forms of physical body, if I then can experience a state of being aware of it. This awareness is of course not the mental functions as we know them. It is a mental function; it has nothing

It is nothing that is a result of that what I happen to see with any of my sense organs or become so-called--again we use the word--awareness, for that in ordinary life. The awareness has to be free from this partiality; it has to be free from identification. It has to be, with other words, free from myself. So in order to start to establish this, I assume now that something exists which functions in that sense. I call it the beginning of an "I." In reality it must be part of me, but since this is a relatively difficult concept, I assume now that something exists as if outside of me which is now observing me. And then I make a distinction between "I" and "it." "It" being my personality as it is behaving and "I" being the observer or the objective faculty. The problem is now can I, with the way I am, subjectively colored and tinted, produce certain food for the feeding of "I" if "I" has to be objective? That's a big problem because how will an objective something start out of a thought process which is subjective? For the time being again I use the terminology of "as if": AS IF it exists, I assume it will exist. Then I act in accordance with that so-called existence. And because of the activity I create a positivity of the "as if" going over into the reality of existence. You understand this philosophical ideas? It is quite logical. We do it many times that way. But in any event there is the possibility that ultimately that what I first assume to exist can exist, and particularly when I can verify the existence by that what I as observing now receive in the form of information about myself. The clearer this is, the more it is, let us say, pure, the less it is affected as an obser-

vation process by any kind of a feeling, the more I will know that I reach reality, or at least that I have an absolute value to deal with. So one starts. And I say here I sit and now I wish to be aware of myself sitting. I don't describe the sitting or how I sit. B I become aware of myself being in this chair and the awareness means I exist. Now for this existence and the realization that I exist, of course, I can use my eyes. I can look at myself and say, "Yes, I exist; this I know by experience." If I close my eyes I don't see myself; at the same time I have a memory and I remember that I had my eyes open and I saw myself. When I close them now the memory will tell me that I still exist. Now when I change myself in a different posture in which I am, then I have a little more difficulty because then I cannot see it; I can not verify it with my eyes. And still it is possible that I have a certain awareness that continues to tell me as an experience that I exist. If I put myself into a different kind of posture than usual, something for which I have no means of recognizing by means of muscles or tensions, even then something in me can remain aware of my existence as a body. This would be true of earth. It requires an effort of changing over from alertness into awareness. It requires a continuation of such an effort to change awareness into awakening. And still this would be the aim if man could be awake and then experience the state of self-consciousness in which if he does experience it, he will have certain information or data which are different from that what he receives in ordinary life. The question, then if I wish to become self-conscious, I have to verify for myself that my experiences are different from the experiences of ordinary life. And of course that form of consc ousness if I do experience, I know that, that it has that particular kind of a result. How difficult it is, of course, I will look all the time for little short cuts. I also will be constantly affected by the state of my mind, telling me that I can do it a little easier by simply using ordinary thinking processes. And all the time when it is difficult I will fall back to that what is a little

easier. And the existence of the little I, practically non-existence, not knowing how to feed it in the beginning, simply making attempts, trial and error, and everything surrounding it being its enemy because it is an unnatural process. All of that is included in simply defining how difficult it is even to try to become awake. And at the same time it seems worth while because if I could be awake, something in me would be free. And I would from the standpoint, you might say, a higher level of being where I then could live, look on me in an objective sense, and then my judgment would be impartial.

_____: The nature of the impedance to becoming aware, as you suggest, is that you try to step back; all the paths that I see...

Mr. Nyland: Step back?

_____: Step back to something which is easier. It is diff'cult to be aware....

Mr. Nyland: It is not a step back, is it?

_____: Not a step back, but you start--

Mr. Nyland: It's selecting of something that I know is easier. If it is difficult to acquire a method, I will of course try to create conditions in which I can do it, you know?

_____: Do you think it is possible to get to the root of that type of stoppage or that type of impedence trying to tackle it every time that it occurs, trying to nibble away at--

Mr. Nyland: I think that by constant effort one learns gradually how to sharpen that tool. It is difficult of course in the beginning because as I say, there are so many factors involved that I can not determine it. But if I constantly try it, it is like a drop of water on a rock; it will start finally to dissolve something and after a little while it will make a hole. It is the persistence that will do it, which will produce in man a very definite wish to produce a fact which is almost unattainable to him. To some extent certain things will start in motion that he wants to accomplish it exactly because it is impossible. If it actually is possible

for that someone has to take the word of someone else who has tried it and says, "I have reached it." But even at that, even if one is not 100% conscious, there is a certain experience on the way to consciousness which leads one to believe that it might be possible if I only persist. How to do it, and that there are many trap-doors through which I can fall and that there are temptations to take a little bit of a short cut, that I don't want to pay in the form that is required, I think is quite logical. Each person doesn't want to, and this is inherent in him, doesn't want to spend any more in either money or energy than he absolutely has to. And regarding this kind of accomplishment of trying to find something that is useful to him, he is not going to will, he is not willing to pay the highest price that is being asked. He's going to quibble with it. He will try to do his best to get it as cheaply as possible if it only will work. And when he comes to the conclusion that that what is cheap is not permanent enough, he will have to pay a little more.

_____: It seems that in self-awareness, self-awareness involves self-awareness of pain.

Mr. Nyland: You're asking it is an awareness; the awareness has to do only with the body as it is and accepting it as it is.

_____: I mean the notion of past-awareness? that you spoke of earlier. You spoke about a notion of past-awareness didn't you?

Mr. Nyland: No. No,what could I have meant by...

** _____: Ah, self-remembering is what I was thinking of; I don't know the words too well.

Mr. Nyland: Ah, is that what you mean. Yes, it is not an awareness. An awareness is an experience at this moment. Self-remembering, of course, what is memory of that what you were as self.

_____: I see. Using that as an expression then, would it involve self-remembering of a painful....

Mr. Nyland: Oh, I believe that many of the things one could remember.

But you see, this is connected with Self. It makes the remembering very specific. I remember everying if my memory is good enough.

_____: So what I was getting at is that, uh, in taking self-remembering as some kind of stepping stone to anticipation....

Mr. Nyland: No, I don't think it is as good a word for that. It is only to indicate in what direction self-observation should go. It is in order to try to define almost what I am looking for. But when I simply say I have to remember myself, I really don't know what that means. It's just a word.

_____: But it invokes so many things....

Mr. Nyland: It can; it can if it is defined further. The word self-remembering has no more meaning for me than only what I say, I remember myself. But I have no definition, no description, and I don't even know what is meant by socalled memory. I would much rather be explicit when I say observation I can define that. Observe means that there is something that has an ability, that is observation; it has an observer; it has an observee, and it has an instrument.

_____: Well, it seems to me that self-remembering is so often confused with self-awareness...

Mr. Nyland: I don't know. Is it?

_____: It seems, it appears to me to be.....

Mr. Nyland: Maybe so; if it is confused, then people have to unconfuse themselves.

_____: Yes, now how do you unconfuse yourself?

Mr. Nyland: By trying to find out what is meant by self-remembering.

_____: I mean I am always confusing the pain of self-remembering with the self-awareness.

Mr. Nyland: Why should self-remembering give you a pain?

_____: I wish I knew.

Mr. Nyland: Then I am afraid that you are not Self-remembering.

_____: It seems that this self-remembering with, can come with pain.

Mr. Nyland: No, it....

_____: It produces sometimes.....

Mr. Nyland: You know, I don't agree with you--

_____: not always....

Mr. Nyland: If you make it concommitant

_____: Well, I say speaking personally.

Mr. Nyland: That may be. That may be your personal experience. Against that I can give my own, and say that it has no pain.

_____: Of course.

Mr. Nyland: You see? So each persona would have to verify it. And I still would say that if a person trying to self-remember or in that sense become self-aware--that then when he has a pain he is on the wrong path. That would be my suggestion; try it again.

_____: But, it, it seems that from what you said the notion of a self-willed condition doesn't really exist.

Mr. Nyland: Now you see, how difficult it is. Because now you use the word self-willed! Unless you define it, we can't talke about it.

_____: It's unfortunately, the very notion of definition when you are talking about self-willed condition is itself begging the question always and, uh, ....

Mr. Nyland: Yeah, but we can come to some kind of a conclusion that what you mean by will I also understand.

_____: Well, if I mean, for example, that my self-will does not seem to be somehow subject to the natural laws of causality, the scientific laws of causality, as, well, the whole, the whole... the paradign of causality is changing so swiftly that---

Mr. Nyland: That's right.

_____: --we cannot even really talk about causality because no body agrees what it is.

Mr. Nyland: That's right, you see, so I try to leave out all these things about which there is a little question and I try to come down to something that everybody could understand. Each person could have a concept of what his body is. Each person can have an idea of what is meant by observing. Each person can put to practice these simple rules to see that when he tries to observe he could try to become impartial, non-identified, and that he tries again and again to do this at the moment when it happens, when activity takes place. And I limit my self now to such simple terminology. I don't fall into a trap of philosophy. I never know where I will end. I will end at the point, as I said some time ago, of how many angee are on top of a pin. Interesting enough, to philosophize. But it doesn't buy me any bread. The reason why Gurdjieff has a certain advantage over some of the other things which we don't know much about is that it is a requirement to put to practice that what one knows. And that only because of that there is the possibility of a change in man's life. If I keep things as a theory, something also as a nice feeling, it is not changing me; it is changing that what I occupy or that what is engaged. Intellectually it can be very lovely and beautiful; emotionally I also can have an experience. But as a man in life I am not changing.

_____: As a man in life who feels no pain, it's very difficult to speak about pain.

Mr. Nyland: That's right, but I was not talking about pain; you talk about pain; I don't.

_____: But I mean, can you know what I mean by pain, if you don't experience it?

Mr. Nyland: Oh, yes. Sure I know pain. I knowpain physically and also psychologically. Yes, you see, but these are problems that each man faces and some way or other and dependent on his experiences. I am starting at the bottom of the ladder to try to develop something which ultimate-

ly may be of use to me, including coming up with this particular problem of pain. But if I start doing it now, I forget that I have work to do. The emphasis with Gurdjieff is on WORK--WORK ON ONESELF. It is application of what I know. And it is the only way--in accordance with Gurdjieff--how one will reach understanding as a result of experience. I do not get it by keeping on thinking and thinking even with the most and the best well-meaning intention. And I don't get it just by expressing certain things emotionally in some form or other even,if you want,the creation of art or whatever or maybe a book. It doesn't help me at all if I'm angry to remember that there was a beautiful thought at a certain time in the past. If I go to church and I'm affected, and then when I come out to the outside of the church and someone steps on my toes, I swear at him. I don't care how beautiful the sermon was and how much I was affected. I remain an ordinary man. It is exactly that I want to know that my feet are still on the ground. That even if I become engaged intellectually or emotionally and have a good time, that it does not change necessarily my behavior. Not necessarily. It could. If I am constantly living in the affairs of my father as it were, of course, I would be a different man. But who does it?

_____: You're talking about doesn't, uh, somethings, not buying bread and a lot of great--many things don't buy bread. Trying to determine how many angels dance on the top of a pin probably doesn't. But eliminating pain buys a kind of bread.

Mr. Nyland: Yeah, but why do you harp on pain all the time?

_____: Well because pain is one of my problems....

Mr. Nyland: That may be so, but at the same time that is...

_____: and I think it is the problem of a lot of other people.

Mr. Nyland: Probably is.

_____: And it's one of the reasons why we are trying to develop a greater awareness so that eliminate this.

Mr. Nyland: Would it be possible that pain would be eliminated after you have accomplished certain other simple things?

_____: I don't know.

Mr. Nyland: Well, I would assure you that it is better not to bother too much about pain at the present time because you'll remain identified with it. And if one of the rules is to try to become non-identified, I try to exclude pain in all the experience I want to become observant to. I start with the simple things where I have a good chance of, or at least the possibility, and I don't start with conditions which I know I'm licked before I start. When I try to consider the question ofpain, and I say pain physically, and that what is now affected, and if the result in a pain to my consciousness that I say it is hateful, if I could observe that particular part which is now causing me pain---

_____: Let's call that inharmoniousness, then, rather than call it pain, not to call it pain; that's a word I would rather use anyway.

Mr. Nyland: Good, but do you know how to make it harmonious?

_____: No, I don't but--

Mr. Nyland: O.K.

_____: I would like to ask one question and then return it to you.

Mr. Nyland: Um hum.

_____: It seems to me that if I'm right--and I don't know Gurdjieff--this is my first exposure to him--that Self-remembering involves a certain, a certain kind of awareness in some people. Perhaps not in myself; I won't say that it does. But it seems to involve certain notions of one's own past inharmoniousness and what we are trying to do is trying to learn how to acquire a greater harmony--universal harmony, cosmic harmony, individual harmony, or harmony with a capital H. I don't really know how many kinds of harmony there are.

Mr. Nyland: It doesn't matter as long as they are all harmonious.

_____: And it seems to me that this, that that working towards

something involves using, using a motive, a power, a force, which derives from what is or what has been. And if what is and what has been involves a recollection or an awareness of the inharmoniousness, then what we are working for, we are working for with some anticipation of greater lack of harmony or some, some additional lack of hermony or continuing disharmony. And this produces anxiety which makes it very very difficult to base any work on it.

Mr. Nyland: If you looking for something of more harmony or less harmony?

_____: I'm looking for something of harmony, harmony.

Mr. Nyland: More or less?

_____: I don't know whether we can quahify it, can we?

Mr. Nyland: The same way that you qualify that you want to go up when you are below, that is you want to reach a higher level. I think--

_____: Only in an airplane.

Mr. Nyland: No, no, no, no, no, no, no.

_____: I, I don't--

Mr. Nyland: You want to go the other way then? Call it inner life. The further one goes to inner life the more essential he could become. When I take the totality of as far as I see of all the heavens and this little bit of a concept that that what I consider God is always so-called situated above me; in any event it would be away from earth. That would determine the direction. Now, if I say I want more harmony, it may be that higher, up away from earth harmony is more than it is at the present time here. But you see, I think you are losing yourself in all kinds of words. And for me it is not practical. It's a nice consideration and I am not disagreeing with it, but it doesn't help me. I say it doesn't help me at all in my automatic reaction. It doesn't help me when I consider that I know that I am constantly mechanical. And that I know that I am constantly mechanical. And that I am almost preordained to behave the way I am. Because I have done that way, and I can not change it even if I

wish. My reactions to people always are the same kind. And particularly when I am unconscious. It is that what we are considering if it is possible for man to free himself from such conditions. If I think in a certain stereotyped form, if I am always interested in my own conditioning and rationalizations processes, if I'm always trying to see if that what I'm doing ought to be done with the least amount of effort or that I do not want to face the truth about myself but have an excuse. These are the problems of ordinary behavior of man and the description of his psychological state. But you see when I become interested in a little bit of a false philsophical question of where does pain come from; it shouldn't be there. And I want to go up to harmony. I'm not there as yet to go. The concepts are very much simpler. If it takes a person as we all are in a particular human quality, but for the time when I want to indulge in any desire, to find out what things are, and I spend the time on it, of course I can do, and it probably will be very enjoyable. I'm afraid, however, if I do, it ties me even a more down to earth. And if my purpose is to try to understand how to get away from it, even if later on I might wish to return, it certainly means that I first have to keep pace. I don't become free by keeping on with the identification with my mind. Can we leave it?

_____: Sir?

Mr. Nyland: Can we leave it at that?

_____: Certainly.

_____: Could you speak on those external forces that shape man's condition?

Mr. Nyland: Well, I think they are all the time there. Everything we are exposed to, everything that reaches you by means of your sense organs--this will shape you. If you want to consider man as a result, as a result of what he is affected by, there are of course three forms that affect him: food in an ordinary sense--solid food. Whatever he eats, he digests;

it goes over into certain chemical substances which are necessary for the maintenance of his body. It sometimes can give even a little , a bit of an inspiration of a certain kind if it happens to fill that part of his feeling center, and it might even give him thoughts or the possibility of himself of doing what he would like to do or what he would like to reach. When it is a question of air, it's another form of food. That is, the solid, liquid, and gas. And gas would be a little comparable to air; air is definitely a form of food which has in it sufficiently for me to maintain myself partly because of the oxygen and partly because of the help of the blood circulation and partly because of that what is air seems to have an effect of helping the digestion of the first food. Again it might be a little of an assumption that if I simply eat and I wouldn't breathe, that I only would come up to a certain point, but if that what is air comes in, it helps the further digestion of the food in myself in order to give it food for a little bit of a higher intellectual or at least an emotion center. I can imagine very well the person who is not breathing but still is alive by taking on a certain form of food which is transformed in him chemically. It could be considered a form of life. But when it is, not reproducing it in any sense and when it has no particular mental functions or even a feeling center, it is not much of a man. And I think at the present time that way a man is, he is always breathing. And when he doesn't breathe, we apparently don't call him a man; we simply say he is dead. Now the third form of so-called food as, as energies from the outside which reach us now by means of sense organs, and I get energy by means of looking. When my eyes are functioning, when my ears are functioning, when I have a touch, a sense of touch or smell, whatever it may be, something is coming into me because of that particular process. And I call them IMPRESSIONS because THEY REPRESENT THAT WHAT IS ENERGY IN A FORM, probably a little bit more ethereal than my ordinary food, but nevertheless I keep on being dependent on it. So

even if I say if I did not have impressions, even then I couldn't live. It is quite possible that that is the truth, that all I, that if I try to reduce every influence on me, if I try and I cannot do it because I cannot die. But if I could imagine how it would be if I had no eyes, no ears, no other sense organs, what would remain? A lump of flesh which is breathing, but would my blood circulate, when it does not receive any impressions in my brain? How would my brain function when it has to direct the blood circulation or the nervous system, or whatever there is that is physiciologically necessary for me? You see, so, we don't have to assume it because so far all we know is that the man only exists when he has enough to breathe, enough air to breathe, enough food to eat, and enough impressions to keep him alive. Now these particular forms of energy are digested in a man and they serve two purposes: one is to maintain for himself the existence of his body and all the functions of the organs in the way they should function. Now there should be enough of that form of energy for him to supply that. In addition, there may be a certain something that is a little extra which you might say is not immediately necessary for the maintenance of man as a body but which could give him satisfaction in order to project a possibility for himself of extending in the direction, and there are four, in the direction which man could have his interest. One is science. Really discovery of that what exists, and why. Philosophy also to some extent, or to a great extent, a mental question of an intellect wanting to deep or delve deeper into existing things in order to see the correlation between them. Whatever I would like to define as a philosophy, it is something that occupies my mind and for which I have to have a desire to wish to think in that way. The other two have to do with my feelings; I simply call creation of art as an expression of something I want to make which does not exist, which of course I would need not only interest but energy to do it. And the other is a feeling of religiousness, the realization of man that he exists

and that he has also spiritual qualities which also exist and of which he is sufficiently aware and assumes that because they exist in him, they may exist in others and it may then cause a relationship between other people or and himself on a certain basis which is not primarily physical. And perhaps with this, as a religiousness, with trying to make sense out of it, that he will have to assume that there is a religious feeling or the existence of something of a spiritual value outside of human beings as represented partly by animals and plants and perhaps partly represented by the configuration of the spheres. Whatever it may be, his religiousness will enable him to give a satisfactory answer to what might be his place and particularly when he thinks that if he lives in accordance with certain rules, as sometimes are indicated by religions in the form of dogma, that in living that kind of life, he will reach heaven or at least he won't be punished. Whatever it may be, these are extra things for a person and in general I say they belong to his inner life which is not necessary as far as earth is concerned, at least in most cases to be able to get along in this world, although the world is complicated and it requires sometimes a little bit more of a dexterity than an aborigine so, you see when the energies now that I receive as food can be divided: one in the maintenance and definitely a protection of my body for the maintaining of the organs that I have intellectually, emotionally, and sexually. And that there is a certain energy which I would like to use and I call it aspiration. That is, a man aspires to possibility of something outside of him to which he would like to go which for him has more value and he would like to reach it. And for that he is willing to pay a little price in the form of energy or the sacrifice of not using as much energy for one purpose in order to make it available for the other one which is for him a little higher or more valuable. As a result of this, when a man starts to grow a little further, his aspiration will change over into Inspiration. Inspiration is a realization of

of man that there is something in him that ought to be developed from which standpoint, if it is developed, he will be able to look at life in a different way. And thereby he need not constantly live on the periphery of his living, but he can withdraw at will to something inside which he is more at rest since it is less disturbed. There is, of course, a third form in which this particular, and it is an emotional form of energies can help of man when he is actually at peace or at ease with himself, when he is at equilibrium, that although there is activity, the activity to the left and the activity to the right match each other. For him it is then a form of silence in which he need not express anything or have any particular criticism or any particular desire for definition. This form of silence for man is represented in the physical body as a state of relaxation. In his intellectual part it simply means that there is a balance between the conflicting thoughts that otherwise are there and they can leave each other alone and co-exist. As far as his emotional center is concerned, it is a state in which he is at one with himself. You see, I would almost say now further questions asked! It is the realization of his Being as he is without any need for further activity. I don't want to say that this is an ideal state; I don't believe that it is really required to stay in that, but it is a means of going into something else as a result of having one's being established in that sense first.

_____: You seem to be describing the deep state of meditation.

Mr. Nyland: No, not necessarily meditation. Meditation is starting, of course, in the mental sense with a wish in which one's fears start to enter. And then one reaches by means of meditation, can at least reach, a certain state in which that what is mental is reduced to minimum. That is possible. But then you see, that is so close to the possibility of being asleep that unless there is something that can remain in existence, it is of very little use to meditate. I experience something which is

desireable but I can't do anything with it. And although the memory remains, it is not permanently written in it. I have to go again and again through the same process of meditation in order to reach it. Well, I can reach many states like that in a different way. I can become engaged in something with enthusiasm. In that I can lose myself. And during the time I experience it, I have a tremendously marvelous time. Still I do not know because of that how to treat my mother-in-law. You see, it is not practical enough. If I wish God, I have to be able to call on God on the telephone any time and I want him to answer.

_____:Will he tell you how to treat your mother-in-law?

Mr. Nyland: I have to find his number; that is the problem of life: What is God's number and where is his area code? Still if it were not possible. You see, the telephone is exactly that kind of an instrument. It is there any time I wish. It does not mean that I have to use it all the time; but I, if it is necessary, that it is God, consciousness must be available any time I wish. It does not mean I will always be conscious, but it never must fail.

_____: It never must what, sir?

Mr. Nyland:Fail. When I wish it to be there, it has to be there. I'm talking now about the use of conscious energies for ordinary life. Well, you see, that's all there is to it. It's very simple. And even if you tried it during this time you sat here, and if you're honest, you know that you were asleep. It is that difficult that even with the best of intentions you set out; you want to be awake; you want to be conscious; and the intention is right and your wish is right and you try. Half a second later it's gone. Try it. You verify it. You won't understand why, because you know that you are sincere. You know that there is something;if it were in the way you would remove it, but don't even know what it is at this time. It is the constantly falling back on the ordinary pattern of life which is dependent on mental functionings

the way they are. And to put something in its place, or at least allow it to exist in the presence of that what is surely in the beginning quite animosity--a great deal of animosity, simply because ordinary mental processes are used to each other the way they are, even if the different parts of the brain function separately every once in a while from each other and the different forms of mental activity can go on at the same time. Whenever something is introduced that has this particular semblance of objectivity, everything else around it as mental functions objects to the kind of an intruder. They are afraid of their own existence, you might say; danger that somehow or other their particular life in an ordinary unconscious mental state will be ended and that enemy then is looked upon as something that ought to be eliminated. And that any attempt on the part of an objective faculty to remain in existence is immediately opposed to by such tremendous quantity of ordinary unconsciousness that in the beginning it has no possibility even to remain in existence. Only by constant efforts gradually it is realized that something can exist--I say co-exist without doing any danger or damage to the rest and that the whole function of "I" is that it is separated from what I am now calling unconscious existence of a personality.

_____: You wouldn't talk about wasted energy and how to avoid wasting yourself?

Mr. Nyland: But there is always a waste--

_____: Can you limit it somehow?

Mr. Nyland: Simply because I don't know how much is needed. But if I see that it is wasted, I try to do it less. For instance I sit and I notice that my muscles are tense. Well, I know it is tense, and I also know that it is not needed. I try to detension it. If I talk superfluously, bla bla bla bla bla, it's a waste of energy. If I hear it, maybe I can stop it. If I sleep too much, that I'm a little ashamed of telling people it is already 9 o'clock and I'm still in bed, I try to sleep 7 hours,

6 houre, 5 hours. I try to find out how is necessary for me to allow myself that form of--not laziness-rrecuperation. I eat; I love food; I eat a hell of a lot; I feel bad. I eat less; I still feel bad because I am not strong enough. Where is the mean? Where is the average I should What is required in certain conditions for me to eat? How much? Kind of food? Nourishing or not? All of that, it's within my range of research. I can experiement. Someone I meet, he always pulls me off. I always argue; I always get jealous. Why do I meet him? Because I have to in my profession. O.K. What is the profession worth? So many dollars per week. If I don't like it, I go somewhere else. I'm constantly filled with considerations of that kind. When I become interested in the use of energies which somehow or other are available to me and partly you might say because of my own work or effort or living, I still remain responsible as a manager of a factory. Because my body is a factory, a transforming station of all kind of chemicals into different kind of chemicals so that they become more assimalable by my body for the purpose of maintaining myself. This is not only physiologically, psychologically. Everything that takes place psychologically with me I will try to become responsible when I say I don't want to waste any energy in any form whatsoever and when I know it has reached its uselessness, when it is in a state in which I see it going out more than what is coming in, I'm not a good provider, I'm not a good manager, and I'm not a good man. It is a requirement for myself that whenever I have something of which I become responsible that it is going to be run in accordance with the rule of lean health. Not too much, not too little. Like a carburetor functioned for an engine when there is just enough gasoline and just enough air. A little too much of one or the other will make it choke or it will make it stand still. You see, if the problem of oneself is oneself, something in me is interested in it and it may be for time being my memory. And if I consider the way I spend my time and I consider at the end of a week, at the end of a year,

that it has been quite useless and didn't get me anywhere; if I am interested in changing I probably have a chance to try to define how to spend my time better. But if I am not interested in it, why should I bother? If I make a statement I'm wasting and I don't do anything about it, I'm stupid because I pretend to think that I ought to do something by saying I'm wasting. I don't mean it. I don't give a damn. But when I really feel it in my bones as an experience, as I know I am wasting, I will do something about that. Find out. Write it up. Little pieces of paper. You can figure it out in calories if you like. Go as far as you like, but start with very easy things. As I say, it must give attentions to something that is almost so obvious. You life 100 pounds. Look at the expression on your face. Quite nonsensical. You have anger. Everything in your body is engaged in it but a little bit of anger? Only when you want to hit someone, you have to do it. You know. You understand what I mean. It is so simple.

_____: Mr. Nyland, would you say that there is a force in the universe which, which causes man to be asleep? Should you--

Mr. Nyland: No, I think it is not a force in the universe as a whole. I think it is a result of earth.

_____: Why that?

Mr. Nyland: Well, because earth happens to be in a certain place in what is called a cosmic ray. Cosmic ray is a relationship between--we use simply that term, simply positive and negative absolute as a form of expression of life which in the sense of ordinary terminology is involution. And it is a growth in the universe which is definitely noticeable by an expanding universe--there must be a growth in it--that it happens to be that earth is at a very unfortunate place in it. This particular growth and any kind of a process of this kind can be expressed by means of an octave. And there happen to be in the octave certain spots that are very unfortunate. And one of them is FA, because that happens to be

a division of one and a half compared to one only of the other intervals. And earth happens to be at FA, so the conditions of the cosmic ray of which earth, our solar system, is a part, happens to affect earth in the way it does and as a result everybody on earth is affected. That is why I think it is a condition that is inherent of earth and because of that Gurdjieff calls it an unfortunate planet. That earth should be a planet like Venus or Mars or any of the others. And that only that because it has a certain function to fulfill in the place in which it is in order to become for the totality of the cosmic ray, a transforming station--for that reason mankind was born on earth to transform energies involutionally in order to make things continue to the growing point of that cosmic ray. Not necessary to go too much into philosophy, but there is a very definite reason, there's a....

_____: O.K. Can I ask another question?

Mr. Nyland: Um hum.

_____: All right. I would disagree with that, but the next question is: would you say, based on that understanding that you have conveyed, that the, the man who--to wish to be awake not to sleep--would you say that that is possible for every man on earth, that that, that every man--does it--it certainly hasn't been the case, you have given a very accurate description---

Mr. Nyland: The possibility exists for everyone. The probability exists for a few.

_____: For a few.

Mr. Nyland: Actuality for even less.

_____: For the chosen, huh?

Mr. Nyland: No, it is the totality of mankind that determines that. It is a body. Not all the cells in your own body are equal. You see, several cells in your body are supporting cells. Several people on earth are supporting individuals for the totality of mankind. Now certain sections or parts of the totality which have to function as organs,

exactly the same as in a body of a man. There are some cells that have to take care of, let's say, vision or a heart or whatever may be, special kind of organs, and the rest remain supportive.

_____: One other question. The way you've been describing you are only talking about man becoming a human being, but would you say that as man is asleep he has a possibility asleep of being a human being?

Mr. Nyland: It all depends on how you define human. If human is limited to the existence on earth, it's perfect.

_____: But man was made to live on earth as well.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, I think he has a dual function.

_____: His role.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, he finds himself on earth so there has to be something on earth to do with him. The question is: Is man only earthly?

_____: No, but man can also be free on earth.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, if he works. Because under the ordinary of unconsciousness he is not free.

_____: So you attach effort to that. There has to be effort.

Mr. Nyland: I'm afraid so. I think it always has to be worked for, because it is not given as far as Mother earth, Mother Nature, is concerned. Mother Nature will not allow any more than what is absolutely necessary for the maintenance of Mother Nature. By Mother Nature, I mean nature on earth.

_____: So there are steps to guide and one has to achieve that realization through working.

Mr. Nyland: I think so. Yes, quite definitely. I think that is also quite noticeable in any kind of a religion. And that what has already existence for years and years. I wouldn't say it has been proven, but it is logical.

_____: But certainly not today the way ordinary religions approached--one doesn't get that feeling.

Mr. Nyland: One can be quite critical about religion as it is at the present time.

_____: You, you are, Mrs. sat telling us, is giving us another way to go.

Mr. Nyland: That's right.

_____: which is really ourselves.

Mr. Nyland: Is what?

_____: Is another extension of ourselves, or we are God.

Mr. Nyland: I don't know. It is a step; it is not like extension, you know.

_____: step, right.

Mr. Nyland: A step is different.

_____: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: You understand what I mean?

_____: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: If it were just an extension, you might say we wait for evolution to come, but a step-wise progress requires very special kinds of laws.

_____: But you believe in evolution, then?

Mr. Nyland: Of course, but step-wise. In the structure, structure of an atom there are definitely steps between the rings of the electrons.

_____: You look as evolution in terms of steps towards God, but that's a very good way of looking at it....

Mr. Nyland: No, no, it doesn't have a value placed on I because if it is an evolution it is still subject to a certain time line. But when I am sufficiently far away from it, it will appear as a continuous line. All steps will resolve into a line. So it depends how you look at it. If I'm close to it, it's still is a step. When I am far enough away in the objective sense, it would be a line.

_____: I have a question. When the man is freed, are the supporting cells freed? And that question extends to the world: when a men is free are the supporting cells free?

Mr. Nyland: Then the question is what is freed in man? Or when he says he wishes freedom, what is it that wishes freedom? For what?

_____: That is not my question. I didn't, maybe I didn't state it properly. For example, if a single man is freed, are all men freed? Is it possible for all men to be freed through a single man becoming free?

Mr. Nyland: All, all men now not free?

_____: No.

Mr. Nyland: You see, why then single out a single man? Are you free?

_____: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: You are? Then you ought to know.

_____: I was just asking you....

Mr. Nyland: Well, the trouble is I am not free. So that lets me out. Now----

_____: I wish--I didn't quite understand the, your description of involutional use of energy.

Mr. Nyland: It's very difficult.

_____: Could you describe that again. I'm---

Mr. Nyland: It is a form of balance between forces in which there is something that is taking place--you might say going from one side to another--but that is already a contradiction in terms because if it exists it exists all over or it exists eternally or if it is omnipresent. I have to introduce a form of infinity--when I now consider evolution and involution, I split infinity up into component parts in order to make it more understandable for me what happens when I experience something that I am opposed by one force and I am helped by another. You see, sometimes good and evil, if you like, sometimes positive and negative.

_____: What you are saying, if I can understand this correctly, what you're saying is that your notion of evolution, or the word evolution as you're using it, as it is applied to man's awareness, is an evolution

that he helps himself to acquire--

Mr. Nyland: No, I think that that applies at every place of what I call the cosmic ray, that it lies at every place in the so-called universe, if I can define space that way. It is everywhere. Evolution is everywhere. It is not bound when I look at it from the standpoint of infinity. It becomes bound when I compare it to my own state in which I'm limited. When I want to understand my limitedness, I have to use phraseology belonging to that, and I have to use words for it. Only in that sense can I use a word "Involution" and "Evolution." If evolution for means me, for me, me means that I can leave what I am going in the direction of, what I call a higher form of living, then involution must be the reverse. At the same time involution must ben an indication of life being expanded. And evolution would mean the certain form by which this life again wants to regain where it originally came from. This is where the balance has to be. And I oppose then, simply involution and evolution as something in which I at the present, present time find myself on earth finds itself or the Sun finds itself or all kind of Milky Ways would find themselves, simply because it happens to be that kind of universal law of exchange of substances. As long as I have to take that as a concept, then I can not say that it is a concept of unity. It is still a concept of division, although from an infinite standpoint it is unity. In infinity evolution and involution are the same because they have been reduced to one point. And you can say the point has been expanded into the totality of the universe. As I said, it is a little difficult concept.

_____: I think I understand.

Mr. Nyland: Good, wonderful. Yeah?

_____: You mentioned earlier that that the earth was an unfortunate planet because it was at FA. That seems to me that of all the cosmic rays--there being never going through each planet on the universe, that all the planets would be at division FA in their individual cosmic ray.

Mr. Nyland: It all depends where you start.

_____: Well, if you start at the center of the universe...

Mr. Nyland: Yes, and your FA is one and a half note. You see, the question is it blends; all the planets with the earth are in the realm of FA, but the planets are a little closer to the sun SOL and it's still a little closer to MI in the octave. If the one and a half note of FA is divisible by three, the earth is in the first center, the planets are in the last.

_____: And Mars and Venus are a-?

Mr. Nyland: And Mars and Venus are close to Sol; they are already past the difficulty in the FA bridge. As I say, if FA is one and a half, it could be three halves. The first half is close to MI and the last, the first third is close to ME. The third third is close to Sol. There is the difference between the earth being in the lst third and the planets being in the third third. But both are still in FA. You understand?

_____: No.

Mr. Nyland: ---Finished?